

NEW YORK.

MEMORIAL

OF

AGRICULTURISTS AND MANUFACTURERS

OF THE

STATE OF NEW YORK,

FRIENDLY TO THE ENCOURAGEMENT AND PROTECTION OF

AMERICAN INDUSTRY.

JANUARY 3, 1828.

Referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

WASHINGTON :

PRINTED BY GALES & SEATON.

1828.

FARMERS' AND MANUFACTURERS' MEETING.

At a very numerous and highly respectable meeting of Agriculturists, Manufacturers, and others, friendly to the encouragement and protection of American industry, held, pursuant to public notice, at the house of William Germond, in the town of Pleasant Valley, in the county of Dutchess, Gen. James Tallmadge was appointed Chairman, and Jonathan Haight, Esq. Secretary.

After some remarks from the Chairman, explanatory of the objects of the meeting, on motion of Nathaniel P. Tallmadge, Esq. it was

Resolved, That a committee of nine be appointed to prepare and submit resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting.

Whereupon, Nathaniel P. Tallmadge, Thomas L. Davies, Obadiah Titus, Bartow White, Abraham H. Schenck, William E. Rapalje, Daniel Merritt, Leonard Thompson, and Isaac Sutherland, were appointed such committee.

The committee having retired for a short time, returned, and reported the following resolutions: which, being duly considered, were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That we deem it a Constitutional right to assemble on this occasion, and freely express our opinions on the important subject of protecting American industry; and we deem it no less the Constitutional right of Congress to grant such protection; a right which has been exercised by that body from the first organization of our Government, and supported by the opinions of the most eminent men in the nation.

Resolved, That the interest of the farmer and manufacturer are intimately connected, and that they must stand or fall together; and that great pecuniary loss and serious embarrassment have arisen from the delay of the National Legislature to grant them relief; and that equal and adequate protection can alone save them from impending ruin.

Resolved, That the embarrassment experienced by our country and Government, during the late war, for the necessary articles of clothing for our people and army, and for the want of proper means of defence, ought to teach us the necessity of husbanding our own resources, and of giving full and ample protection to our manufactures.

Resolved, That, as other nations have afforded every protection to their own industry, and have, in a great measure, cut off from their markets our bread stuffs and other domestic productions, it is of vital importance to the agriculturists of this country to establish for themselves a home market, by means of our manufactures.

Resolved, That, as far as our experience goes, the protection heretofore given to cotton and other articles has afforded a fair profit to those engaged in the business, a cheaper article to the consumer, and a vast benefit to the country ; we cannot, therefore, doubt that the same will be the result in regard to the protection of wool and woollens.

Resolved, That we approve of the proceedings of the Harrisburg Convention, assembled in July last, and, in general, of the rates of duties there recommended ; but respectfully suggest to the consideration of Congress, an increase of duty on the finest grades of foreign wool, beyond that recommended by said Convention.

Resolved, That the members from this county be respectfully requested to bring the subject of protecting our national industry before the Legislature, and that they take all proper means to procure the adoption of a resolution instructing our Senators, and requesting our Representatives, in Congress, to use their best exertions to obtain the passage of a law which shall afford the protection asked for.

Resolved, That the Hon. Abraham H. Schenck be appointed by this meeting to proceed to Washington, as the bearer of our proceedings to our representative there, and to enforce our claims upon the consideration of the Representatives of the People.

Resolved, That this meeting, confiding in the ability and readiness of the Hon. Thomas J. Oakley, Member of Congress from this district, to aid and sustain the important interests of the agriculturists and manufacturers of this county, do respectfully and earnestly request him to use his utmost endeavors to procure the passage of a law corresponding with the views of this meeting as above expressed.

Resolved, That James Tallmadge, Bartow White, Thomas L. Davies, Henry Swift, and John B. Van Wyck, be a committee to prepare a memorial to Congress, in conformity to the above resolutions.

Resolved, That, in consideration of the important services of H. Niles, editor of the Weekly Register, in sustaining the great cause of domestic industry, we recommend his paper to the liberal patronage of the citizens of this county, and as a means of disseminating correct information on a subject so deeply interesting to every true American.

Resolved, That Nathaniel P. Tallmadge, Thomas L. Davies, Walter Cunningham, James Hooker, and Charles P. Barnum, be a central corresponding committee to further the objects of this meeting.

Resolved, That committees be appointed in the several towns in this county, to correspond with the central committee, and to adopt such other measures in their respective towns as shall be deemed expedient, to carry into effect the great and paramount objects of this meeting.

Under the preceding resolution, the following committees were appointed, to wit :

Amenia—Joel Benton, Taber Belding, Elijah B. Park, John Reade, Philip Flint.

Beekman—Wheeler Gilbert, James Delong, Gabriel L. Vanderburgh, Benjamin Haxtun, Cornelius H. Cornell.

Clinton—Theodorus Wing, John Dodge, Jared Lyon, Thomas Sands, Abraham Golder.

Dover—James Grant, Thomas Taber, 2d, Henry Ward, William C. Freeman, Isaac Vincent.

Fishkill—Bartow White, John C. Van Wyck, William E. Rapalje, James Givan, A. L. Ulric.

Freedom—John De Lavergne, Elijah Townsend, Stephen Titus, Silas Pettit, John Klapp.

Hyde Park—Edmund H. Pendleton, John Johnston, Hunting Sherrill, William Allen, John Purdy.

Milan—Stephen Thorne, Jacob Shook, Jonathan Deuel, John I. Rowe, George N. Martin.

Northeast—Abraham Bockee, Enos Hopkins, William Pugsly, Douglas Clarke, George Brown.

Parwling—Daniel Merritt, William Taber, Albro Akin, Benjamin Burr, James Peckham.

Pine Plains—Israel Harris, Robert Hoag, Allen Thompson, Henry Hoffman, Justus Booth.

Pleasant Valley—William Germond, James Odell, Joho H. Newcomb, Joseph C. Dean, William Thorn.

Poughkeepsie—William Davies, George B. Evertson, John Townsend, Robert Wilkinson, Stephen Cleveland.

Red Hook—Nathan Beckwith, George Shook, Henry Staats, John C. Montgomery, Philip N. Bonesteel.

Rhinebeck—John T. Schryver, Francis A. Livingston, John Armstrong, jr., Garret Van Keuren, Freeborn Garretson.

Stanford—Gilbert Thorne, Leonard Thompson, Isaac Sutherland, Joseph Gildersleeve, Morgan Carpenter.

Union Vale—Stoddard Judd, Israel Fowler, Thomas Andrews, William D. Williams, John Wilkinson.

Washington—John Titus, Stephen B. Trowbridge, Samuel M. Sweet, Isaac Merritt, Platt Sutherland.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be signed by the Chairman and Secretary, and published.

JAMES TALLMADGE, *Chairman*.

JONATHAN HAIGHT, *Secretary*.

MEMORIAL.

To the Congress of the United States :

The memorial of the Farmers and Manufacturers of the county of
Dutchess, in the State of New York,

RESPECTFULLY REPRESENTS :

That the agricultural interest of this portion of the country is greatly depressed, for the want of a sufficient market for its surplus products. The establishment of a home market for bread stuffs, and the supply of new objects for agricultural enterprise, seem indispensably necessary to develop the resources of our country, and secure a continuance of our prosperity. A proper encouragement of the domestic labor of the country, and an adequate protection of manufactures, promises to accomplish those desirable results. Agriculture and manufactures are so intimately interwoven, and inseparably connected, that they have one common interest, and unite to ask encouragement and protection. The wisdom of your honorable body exerted for their benefit, will give new vigor to their energies, diffuse blessings, and add to the resources and strength of our common country.

Your memorialists, while they forbear to dwell upon particulars, believe that a few suggestions, and a summary review, will sufficiently demonstrate the propriety and the justice of their petition.

More than one-half of the population of these United States are growers of grain, flax, and hemp, the raisers of wool, the makers of iron, or the manufacturers of woollen goods, and are in a state of great depression. From the formation of our Government until within the last few years, farming was almost universally as profitable as it is an honorable and useful occupation. Brisk markets and liberal and fair prices stimulated and rewarded the industry of the farmer. From the value and abundance of products, *lands* attained to high prices, and individuals and our nation experienced the blessings of general affluence. In November, 1817, the British ports were closed against our bread stuffs. They were opened, for a short time, in 1818. From this latter year, our bread stuffs have been almost wholly excluded from foreign markets ; whereby the prospects of our farmers have been, from that time, extremely depressed.

The average export of flour, in 1811,

'12, and '13, was 1,383,139 bbls.

Valued by Treasurer's report, \$ 13,980,000

In 1817 and '18, 1,118,437 do 14,664,173

In 1819, '20, '21, '22, '23, '24, '25, '26, 867,044 do 4,882,053

These facts show, at one view, the amazing depression of above ten millions of value in the single article of flour, although with an

increasing population, and the consequent sacrifice sustained by the farming interest. But to appreciate the extent of the depression of former market, it must be remarked, that Mexico and South America have recently afforded a new market, and to which nearly one-half of the flour above stated, in the latter years, was shipped. A corresponding depression of other articles of home production has also taken place. To alleviate the distresses from those causes, and employ the labor of the country, resort has been had to raising of flax, hemp, wool, and the manufacture of iron and woollens. Millions of capital have been allotted to these new pursuits. But, from the peace in Europe, the subjects of those Governments, encouraged by a zeal for importation, have brought from abroad immoderate quantities of rival articles into our market; and, although much sacrifice has been sustained by their foreign owners, yet the effect has been to overstock and render our markets unstable; to prostrate almost every man engaged in the business; dissipate capital, reduce many to poverty, and put thousands of manufacturers and laborers out of employment. Lands purchased at fair prices, when their products had value and market, have been reduced in utility and worth. Many farms, upon which several instalments have been paid, have been sacrificed, and, on a sale, found inadequate to satisfy the sums remaining due. *Bankruptcy* has overwhelmed many who were industrious, prudent, and upright; and it yet threatens greater and continued ravages. The nation is placed nearly in the same state of dependence on foreign supplies, as before the war of the Revolution.

Encouragement and *protection* from Government can alone avert this disastrous and ruinous state of things, now pressing, so severely, so unjustly, and so unnecessarily, upon nearly one-half of the People of this nation.

Against adequate provision for relief from such a state of things, it has been objected, that Congress have not the right to legislate for the encouragement and protection of agriculture and manufactures; but that its lawful powers are restricted, solely, to levying duties for necessary revenue.

The Constitution certainly furnishes no such restriction or limitation of powers; while its whole object and express delegation of power authorizes Congress "to provide for the general welfare." But a reference to the exposition of the Constitution, given by its framers, in their early and continued practice, will most effectually put at rest all doubts on this head.

The *second act* of the *first Congress*, passed on the 4th July, 1789, was an act to provide revenue, and to *encourage manufactures*, and contains this remarkable and explicit preamble: "Whereas it is necessary, for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the *encouragement and protection of manufactures*, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandises, imported."

Gen. Washington, in his message to Congress, in the subsequent year, recommends the subject anew to their notice: "their safety and

interest require that they should *promote such manufactures* as tend to render them independent of others, for essential, particularly military, supplies."

Again, in 1796, he says, "*The encouragement of manufactures* is of too much importance not to receive a continuance of their efforts in every way that shall appear eligible."

Mr. Jefferson, in his message, in 1802, says, "To cultivate peace, and maintain commerce and navigation, to foster our fisheries, and *protect manufactures*, adapted to our circumstances, &c. are the land marks by which to guide ourselves in all our relations."

Mr. Madison, when a member of Congress, in debate, said, "There may be some manufactures, which, being once formed, can advance towards perfection without any adventitious aid; while others, for want of the fostering hand of Government, will be unable to go on at all. Legislative attention will therefore be necessary to collect the proper objects for this purpose." "The States that are most advanced and ripe for manufactures, ought to have their particular interests attended to in some degree. While these retained the power of making regulations of trade, they had the power to protect and cherish such institutions; by adopting the present Constitution, they have thrown the exercise of this power into other hands; they must have done this under an expectation that those *interests would not be neglected here.*"

We might add the names of Hamilton, and many other of the worthies of the Revolution, and set forth their sentiments in favor of the expediency and the right of those powers which we now ask Congress to exercise. But it will be sufficient, that a Washington, a Jefferson, a Madison, and a Monroe, did not fear, nor fail, in succession, to press this all-important and now engrossing subject of agriculture and manufactures on the consideration of Congress. In conformity to such sentiments, and in pursuance of such recommendations, Congress, from the organization of this Government, to 1826, have steadily pursued a system of encouragement and protection to agriculture and manufactures; intending to advance the interests of the whole, by cherishing manufactures generally, and protecting, in just succession, the staples and peculiar products of the different States. Till this system was began and carried into effect, Virginia and Maryland, with their abundance of tobacco, languished without an adequate market. The Carolinas and Georgia, with their cotton, felt the severities of poverty, and even apprehended ruin. The sugar cane was unknown to the South; and the fisheries of the East afforded no adequate compensation for its perilous and arduous pursuit. Under this system of encouragement and protection, we have seen the sickly staples and languishing people of the several districts suddenly rise to health and enterprise, and to the possession of wealth, and the enjoyment of prosperity.

The agriculture of the South is supplied with a new staple in the article of sugar: the cotton product has experienced an almost boundless increase; the tobacco is scarcely adequate to supply the

demand; and the fisheries now afford abundance, and an ample reward to its enterprising followers. We do not complain that our brethren of those favored districts have been thus encouraged and protected, and rendered prosperous and happy, by the friendly care and bounty of Government: but, we do urge that, while they have been made rich, and are in the actual and full enjoyment of so many blessings, springing from such a source, and from such causes, it ill becomes them to set up a constitutional objection, and remonstrate against the object of our petition.

If it is right that they should continue under the protection, and in the enjoyment of their advantages and favors bestowed by Government, it is also right and just that equivalent favors and benefits be extended to us. If the Constitution forbids the one, it also prohibits the other. We have borne our share of "the burthens alleged to be imposed on the many for the benefit of the few," in the protection given to the staples of their districts. If this objection is to prevail against a like protection to us, it is time a general repeal should take place of all laws for encouragement and protection; and the Constitution be thus restored, and "the many no longer continue to be burthened for the benefit and protection of the few."

The agriculture of the grain districts, with a growing population, and increased ability to produce, has sustained a *depression* in the single article of *flour*, of more than ten millions of dollars annually, even after the aid derived from the new market to South America. The *cotton exported*, has *increased* from about two millions value, to \$25,025,214, in 1826. The *sugar*, which was not raised in this country until encouraged, now produces a supply of one-third of the consumption of this nation. The duty of three cents per pound upon the quantity produced if imported, would give a revenue of 1,500,000 dollars. Yet, under circumstances of such a contrast between the grain and the cotton and sugar districts, Louisiana and the South declaim against "monopolies" and the tariff, and remonstrate against adequate encouragement to the staples and the agriculture of the Middle and Western States.

If the domestic labor of the growers of wool, flax, and hemp, and the makers of iron, cannot be protected, but must be left to be supplanted by the products of the Spanish peasantry, the fœdal slaves of Germany, and the serfs of Russia—why should the cotton, sugar, and tobacco of the South, be exempted from a like competition from the cotton of Egypt and the Brazils, and the cotton, sugar, and tobacco, produced by the labor of the miserable slaves of the East and West Indies? Under such competition, the domestic labor of the South would soon perish, and the disastrous prospects which awaited those staples, in 1789, would be reinstated.

But your memorialists repose as little confidence in the solidity, as in the fairness of this class of arguments. They believe experience has demonstrated, that the system of protecting the domestic labor of the country, so far from burthening the many for the benefit of the few, has elicited new sources of wealth and enterprise, has made la-

bor productive, and certain in its rewards, augmented the national wealth, promoted the general welfare, and, in no instance, ultimately increased the price of commodities to the consumer.

A reference to the article of cotton will suffice to elucidate this whole subject: In 1791 we exported 189,316 pounds of cotton. The manufacture of cotton was then scarcely begun in this country. The production and transportation of that amount were the only benefits derived from that article to agriculture and the shipping interest. The production and manufacture of cotton was subsequently encouraged by adequate protection, and, against which the shipping interest were opposed, and even, we also feared, that the many were to be burthened for the benefit of the few. But mark the results. From small beginnings, we have risen to the exportation of 205 millions of pounds in 1826; manufactures have arisen, and, in a great degree, supply the demand for domestic consumption, at about one-third of the former costs; and furnish between five and six millions value of cotton fabrics for exportation, principally to the South American market. The agriculture which formerly furnished 189,316 pounds of cotton, supplied about 205 millions of pounds in 1826. The shipping interest, which opposed this protection to cotton, then transported 189,316 pounds, now transport to foreign markets 205 millions of pounds; and, also, coastwise, to the New England manufactories, a quantity sufficient to be manufactured for the domestic consumption of the country; and for six millions in value of cotton fabrics also, to be transported to the South American market. The agricultural interests, have, in return, found a market for its bread stuffs, in supplying the manufacturers: for, it is a known fact, more flour passes eastward, up the Sound, from New York, for home consumption, than was shipped from her port to foreign markets, in the boasted days of our commercial prosperity.

Without the benefit of this market, a consequence of protection to the manufacture of cotton, the farmers of this State would now have been in a most ruinous condition.

Your memorialists urge, with great confidence, that encouragement to the productive industry of the country, and complete protection to the growth and manufacture of wool, flax, hemp, and iron, will, as in the case of cotton, give value to our lands, new springs to agriculture, diffuse universal joy and happiness over every class of society, and increase, in a million fold, the aggregate wealth and strength of our nation.

It will not escape the observation of every reflecting individual, that the same spirit, and the same system of policy which would have retained us as colonies of Great Britain, although subdued on the question of our independence as a nation, yet seeks to continue our dependence for all necessary supplies on British labor and English manufactures. From the organization of our Government to the present day, it has been their unceasing endeavor to monopolize our trade, and continue us in a state of colonial dependence as mere consumers of British products and British manufactures. They refuse to receive our bread stuffs, and yet urge upon us their manu-

factures. In 1825, we purchased upwards of 42 millions of her merchandise, of which \$10,682,000 was wool and woollens; while they received, in return, not \$200 of the agricultural products of this country, north of the Potomac and Ohio. Yet, we have men among us at this enlightened day, and after the experience in the effect of protection in the articles of cotton, sugar, and tobacco, who still urge the continuance of such a state of things; unequal and impolitic as between nations; and unequal and unjust as between ourselves and different sections of our own country.

It has been stated, in recent British publications, that the labor-saving machinery used in Great Britain, is estimated to be equal to twenty-two millions of laborers. Ought the American manufacturer and agriculturist to be left unprotected, to compete with such an accumulated and prodigious power? And, above all, ought our Government to allow to Great Britain the profit of such mighty power in labor, to be used in manufactures for our consumption, and against us as individuals, and as a nation, when it might as well be used by ourselves, and for our own benefit?

It is admitted, "that nations cannot permanently and profitably trade together, unless it is by the reciprocal interchange of their respective productions." In conformity to this admitted principle, it has been the declared and unvarying policy of our Government, to proffer and invite a reciprocity of trade. All their continued and protracted negotiations with other Governments, and, especially, with Great Britain, have rested upon this just and equal basis; but have been uniformly resisted and rejected by Great Britain. Why, then, should we continue to receive, on favored terms, their products, while ours are prohibited and rejected from their markets? They refuse to put our plough on a footing with their looms. Shall our farmers submit to have their bread-stuffs refused a foreign market, and they remain rival competitors in raising grain without consumers? Ought they to be required, with their surplus and decaying grain on hand, to purchase foreign cloth, to the employment or profit of the Spanish and German farmer, and the British manufacturer, and thereby furnish British agriculture with a home market in supplying bread-stuffs to the manufacturers of cloth, for American consumption? Ought we not rather to protect the productive labor of our own citizens, encourage the growth and manufacture of wool, flax, hemp, and iron, in our own country; divert to other channels a portion of our labor; create consumers, by maintaining our own manufacturers; and relieve agriculture, by lessening competition, and giving a market to the grain-growing interests? Such a system of measures would make us as independent in fact, as we are in form, and coerce and secure that reciprocity in trade, which has been so continually proffered by us, and so often refused by Great Britain.

The shipping and commercial interests have, in various ways, been most expensively encouraged and cherished. It should be remembered by those interests, because the farmers often feel the force and effect of the truth, that, in this collision and contest for reciprocity of

trade and protection to the American merchant, and American ship-owner, the agricultural interest of the country is the club of Hercules, to which resort is constantly had, to maintain the strife, and fight this commercial battle. But, for the just protection given to American bottoms over other vessels, foreign ships would gladly receive and transport our agricultural products at reduced freights, and bring back an abundant return. To maintain a pending commercial contest, the West India market is now lost to our products, and the principal sacrifice falls on the agricultural interest. We ask not any relinquishment of this system of commercial protection and encouragement. But, we do urge, that the vehement opposition of those in the enjoyment of the advantages of this commercial and shipping protection, should not avail to prevent the granting the object of this petition in favor of the depressed agriculturists and manufacturers, and the productive labor of the country.

The memorialists are sensible that the previously granted tariffs have afforded reasonable protection to very many of the articles of domestic growth and home consumption. Cabinet furniture, workers in leather, hats, and such like articles, yet enjoy the protection afforded, and are prospering under its auspices. Although the agriculturist had, as was deemed, a proportionate share of protection, yet, by means of the prohibition to receive the bread-stuffs of this country in the foreign markets, and the want of a home market, the encouragement and protection before given to agriculture, is inoperative, and of little or no practical effect. The system of internal improvements in roads and canals, which is justly the pride of this State, and of this nation, has, in vain, afforded facilities of communication, and brought out the surplus productions from the Western States, only to be added to the previous surplus of like products from the Middle States; and all to remain without a home demand, and prohibited as an article of foreign trade. It is essential to the prosperity of this part of the country, that this state of things should be varied. A foreign market, or home consumption, must be provided for our agricultural products. The one depends upon foreign nations; the other is within ourselves, and depends alone on the wisdom and the energy of Congress. Agriculture, as circumstances are, can only be reached and advanced by encouragement to manufactures, and the establishment of a home market, and the creation of new objects for the use of our lands, and the employment of industry. A protection of wool, woollens, flax, hemp, and iron, will accomplish and secure all those results, so desirable to individuals, and so important to the general welfare. The encouragement afforded to malt liquors, established breweries, provided consumers of bread-stuffs, called for the production of the raw material, and thus gave to the farmer, in the article of barley, a new, and one of the most advantageous and profitable crops. It is by such means, that the agriculturists can only be directly reached and benefited. Protection to wool, woollens, flax, hemp, and iron, will secure augmented benefits to this, we trust, most useful portion of the community.

The proposed rate of duty of twenty cents per pound on wool, with an increase on fine wool, and with an annual rise till fifty cents, will give to the farmer the immediate market on his mixed blood and merino wool. This protection seems due to this class of citizens, and we cannot see any good reason why, to their exclusion, the Spanish, German, and English farmer, should be favored and employed. The admission into the country of wool, costing less than eight cents per pound, without the proposed increase of duties, will leave the Smyrna and South American wool, taken in exchange for our cotton fabrics, and principally used for hats, carpets, and very coarse cloths, unaffected by the desired protection. We raise no such wool in this country: and its exemption, for the clothing of a class of the laborers of the South, appears just and reasonable; and, it would seem, ought to have moderated the keenness of opposition from that source.

Your memorialist beg leave to refer to the preceding resolutions, and humbly pray that the object of the same may be carried into effect, or that such other effectual protection and relief may be granted, as to your honorable body shall seem meet and proper.

By order of the meeting.

JAMES TALLMADGE,
BARTOW WHITE,
THOMAS L. DAVIES,
HENRY SWIFT,
JOHN B. VAN WYCK,

Committee.

